APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/587,756	06/06/2000	Gabriel J. Hall	13237-2595-(MS-149378.1)	9536

			EXAMINER
27488	7590	12/24/2003	VAUGHN, GREGORY J

MERCHANT & GOULD
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	5

DATE MAILED: 12/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A24

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/587,756	HALL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gregory J. Vaughn	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _06 June 2000_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-7 and 9-14_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _8_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _06 June 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Application History

1.   This action is responsive to the application filing, Application filed on 6/6/2000.

2.   Claims 1-14 are pending in the case, claims 1, 4 and 9 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> "A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under
> section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent,
> except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application
> filed in the United States only if the international application designated the
> United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English
> language."

4.   Claims 1,3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Yamaguchi, US Patent 6,098,069 (filed 3/4/1998, patented 8/1/2000).

5.   **In regard to independent claim 1**, the preamble of the claim is directed toward

a method for packing a web page as a single file. Yamaguchi recites: "*the page data*

producing section 15 compiles the HTML data transmitted from the HTTP analyzing

section 12 in S7 and the data transmitted from the reference data obtaining section

16 in S12 in a single data file" (column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 1).

The first limitation of the claim is directed toward determining that a user desires to package a web page into a single file. Yamaguchi recites: "*According to the above method, when the user wants to save the piece of specific data on the network into his/her information processing device or the like*" (column 4, lines 1-3).

The second limitation of the claim is directed toward determining if the file is a web page. Yamaguchi recites: "*In the above method, the reference information means information for specifying a piece of data on the network, being comparable to the URL of the WWW*" (column 3, lines 63-65).

The third limitation of the claim is directed toward the web page containing a link to a resource file. Yamaguchi recites: "*The information for one page is basically composed of multimedia information described in the HTML format, such as construction information, text information, reference information to other media*" (column 1, lines 60-63).

The forth limitation of the claim is directed toward packing the web page file and the resource file into a single file. Yamaguchi discloses a web page with indicated resources being saved into a single file structure in Fig. 4.

The fifth limitation of the claim is directed toward the structure of the packed file as having the main HTML document as a first component of the file, the resource as a secondary component of the file and defining the locations of the first and second components in relation to one another. Yamaguchi discloses a single file combing a web page and it's resources at reference sign 17 in Fig. 10. The single file is shown composed of multiple components, where the first ·component is the HTML

component (shown at reference sign 26c), and secondary components are listed after the HTML component. The single file is also shown with "*Index Information*" Yamaguchi discloses in Fig. 4 how the "*Index Information*" is used to indicate the components relation to each other.

6.   **In regard to dependent claim 3**, the claim is dependent upon claim 1 and is directed toward a computer readable medium. Yamaguchi recites: "*Throughout the following embodiments, it is presumed that the data managing device 1 is disposed in a commonly found information processing device (not shown) complete with a display screen, a keyboard, a CPU (Central Processing Unit), a recording medium, etc. Thereafter, the data file and index information are stored in, for example, a recording medium*" (column 5, lines 40-44).

7.   **In regard to independent claim 4**, the preamble of the claim is directed toward a method for packing a web page as a single file. Yamaguchi recites: "*the page data producing section 15 compiles the HTML data transmitted from the HTTP analyzing section 12 in S7 and the data transmitted from the reference data obtaining section 16 in S12 in a single data file*" (column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 1).

The first and second limitations of the claim are directed toward opening an HTML web page file and parsing it in search of supporting files. Yamaguchi disclose a web file opened and parsed into a data tree with supporting files identified in Fig. 4. Yamaguchi further recites: "*an HTTP data obtaining section (obtaining means) 11, an HTML analyzing section (extracting means) 12*" (column 5, lines 51-53).

The third limitation of the claim is directed toward creating a list of the supporting files. Yamaguchi discloses a list of supporting files in Fig. 2, 3 and 4.

The fourth limitation of the claim is directed toward combing the HTML and supporting files into a single file. Yamaguchi discloses a web page with indicated resources being saved into a single file structure in Fig. 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> *"(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made."*

9.   Claims 2, 5-7 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Apfel et al., US Patent 6,405,225 (filed 1/17/1998, patented 6/11/2002). *"Apfel et al."* is hereafter referred to as *"Apfel"*.

10.   **In regard to dependent claims 2 and 5**, the claims are directed toward the single file being an MHTML file. Claim 2 is dependent upon independent claim 1; claim 5 is dependent upon independent claim 4. Yamaguchi discloses the creating of the single file, but fails to disclose the file as an MHTML file. Apfel teaches the use of an MHTML file. Apfel discloses the equivalence of file types *"e.g., in HTML, plain text, or MHTML"* (column 15, lines 44-45) in the *"SetBody()"* function call of table II.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made for the invention of Yamaguchi to have been capable of managing MHTML files as taught by Apfel so as to realize the benefit that all "*data can be saved with a document, so that it is available when the user recalls the document for a subsequent editing session*" (Apfel, column 3, lines 15-18).

11.   **In regard to dependent claim 6**, the claim is dependent upon dependent claim 5, and is directed toward the structure of the packed file as having the main HTML document as a first component of the file, the resource as a secondary component of the file and defining the locations of the first and second components in relation to one another. Yamaguchi discloses a single file combining a web page and it's resources at reference sign 17 in Fig. 10. The single file is shown composed of multiple components, where the first component is the HTML component (shown at reference sign 26c), and secondary components are listed after the HTML component. The single file is also shown with "*Index Information*" Yamaguchi discloses in Fig. 4 how the "*Index Information*" is used to indicate the components relation to each other.

12.   **In regard to dependent claim 7**, the claim is dependent upon dependent claim 5, and is directed toward parsing an HTML web page file in search of supporting files. Yamaguchi disclose a web file opened and parsed into a data tree with supporting files identified in Fig. 4. Yamaguchi further recites: "*an HTTP data obtaining section (obtaining means) 11, an HTML analyzing section (extracting*

means) 12" (column 5, lines 51-53). A second limitation of the claim is directed toward creating a list of the supporting files. Yamaguchi discloses a list of supporting files in Fig. 2, 3 and 4.

13.   **In regard to independent claim 9**, the claim is directed toward unpacking a MHTML web page to HTML format by determining: a file name, a supporting file location, location availability, and converting and saving the MIME parts of the HTML file. Yamaguchi discloses determining a webpage source file and the location of a supporting file in Fig. 4 at reference sign 26. Yamaguchi discloses location availability in Fig. 5(b) at reference sign S25 and Yamaguchi discloses converting and saving data where the location is not available in Fig. 5(a) at reference sign S26.

Yamaguchi discloses the management of the web and source files, but Yamaguchi fails to disclose the file as an MHTML file. Apfel teaches the use of an MHTML file. Apfel discloses the equivalence of file types *"e.g., in HTML, plain text, or MHTML"* (column 15, lines 44-45) in the *"SetBody()"* function call of table II.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made for the invention of Yamaguchi to have been capable of managing MHTML files as taught by Apfel so as to realize the benefit that all *"data can be saved with a document, so that it is available when the user recalls the document for a subsequent editing session"* (Apfel, column 3, lines 15-18).

14.   **In regard to dependent claim 10**, the claim is dependent upon claim 9, and is directed toward a computer readable medium and computer executable instructions.

Yamaguchi anticipates the claim. Yamaguchi recites: *"the data managing device 1 is disposed in a commonly found information processing device (not shown) complete with a display screen, a keyboard, a CPU (Central Processing Unit), a recording medium"* (column 5, lines 41-44).

15.   **In regard to dependent claim 11**, the claim is dependent upon claim 9, and is directed toward naming the web page source file with a leaf name. Yamaguchi discloses the use of leaf names for web page source files in Fig. 7 and Fig. 9.

16.   **In regard to dependent claims 12, 13 and 14**, the claims are dependent upon claim 9, and are directed toward locating supporting files inside a folder named after the MHTML file where: a file name does not exist for a main portion (claim 12), if the supporting files do not exist (claim 13), or if the supporting file do not exist in the same folder as the main portion (claim 14). The obvious use of the MHTML file is described above (see claim 9). Yamaguchi discloses locating supporting files together in reference to the main file, as shown in Fig. 2. Yamaguchi discloses testing to see if the supporting file exists in Fig 5(b) at reference sign S25.

Allowable Subject Matter

17.   Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would

be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

18.   The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent

to applicant's disclosure:

Patent	Date	Inventor
• US-5,987,611 A	11-1999	Freund, Gregor
• US-6,282,548 B1	08-2001	Burner et al.
• US-6,374,266 B1	04-2002	Shnelvar, Ralph
• US-6,618,728	09-2003	Rail, Peter D.
• US-6,625,624 B1	09-2003	Chen et al.
• US-6,635,088 B1	10-2003	Hind et al.

19.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Vaughn whose telephone number is (703) 305-4672. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached at (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Gregory J. Vaughn
December 9, 2003

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER